



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re Appln. of: Robert Filepp et al.

Serial No.: 09/369,649

Filed: August 8, 1999

Title: INTERACTIVE COMPUTER SYSTEM AND
METHOD OF OPERATION

AMENDMENT

Assistant Commissioner of Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In response to the Official Action dated January 28, 2000, Applicants request that the following amendments be entered in their application, and that their application be reconsidered in light of those amendments and the related remarks presented below.

In the Claims:

Amend Claim 26 as follows:

26. A method for operating a server in a computer network to enable presentation of interactive applications, the network including at least a first server, interactive applications and one or more reception systems, the reception systems being capable of communicating with the server and receiving applications from the server, the reception systems, respectively, having a display interface for presenting applications to respective users, the method comprising steps of:

a. Providing on the network one or more applications that are divided into sections which comprise at least a part of an application page, the application sections being defined by objects; and

7/2000 DC:00000001 090059 09369649
01 FC:117 870.00 CH
02 FC:148 110.00 CH
03 FC:126 240.00 CH

Group Art Unit 2757

Examiner: Moustafa M. Meky

RECEIVED
AUG 15 2000
TECH CENTER 2700

#4/A
Amtd
8.16.00
OC

149

A

Added

b. Generating a display interface at the reception system from objects for requested applications collected at the reception system, the interface including a plurality of partitions for presenting the applications.

REMARKS

THE OFFICIAL ACTION

In the official action dated January 28, 2000, (Action) the Examiner:

- Rejected Applicants' claims 26-36 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as indefinite on the grounds that claim 26 was indefinite because of grammatical omissions, claims 27-36 depending from claim 26; and
- Rejected Applicants' claims 1-36 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting in view of Applicants' claims 1-20 of U.S. patent 5,758,072.

APPLICANTS' RESPONSE

As noted, in the Action the Examiner rejected Applicants' claims 26 - 36 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, because, as the Examiner explained, he believed claim 26 was unclear as to its content since there was no period at the end of the claim and because the conjunction "and" did not proceed the last clause of the claim. Though unstated, it would appear the Examiner rejected claims 27-36 on the same grounds since claims 27-36 depend from claim 26, and since 35 U.S.C. §112, fifth paragraph, requires that dependent claims include the content of the claims from which they depend.

To remove the noted uncertainty, Applicants' have amended claim 26 by adding the conjunction "and" at the end of line 7 following the word "object"; and by adding a period at the end of line 11 following the word "applications" to comply with the Examiners suggestions.

In view of the noted amendments to claim 26, Applicants' respectfully submit claims 26-36 had been rendered otherwise definite and in compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112 second paragraph.

With regard to the examiners rejection of Applicants' claims 1-36 on the grounds of obviousness-type double patenting in view of Applicants' previously issued U.S. patent 5,758,072, since both the current application and U.S. patent 5,758,072 have a common assignee, specifically, the IBM Corporation, Applicants have submitted a terminal disclaimer with this amendment to put this application in condition for allowance.

Finally, Applicants' have also submitted an information disclosure statement with this amendment in accordance with 37 C. F. R. §§ 1.56, 1.97 and 1.98 to direct the Examiner's attention to the patents and other documents cited to and in the Patent and Trademark Office in connection with prosecution of Applicants' prior and related applications, including prior applications: SN. 08/933,488, filed 09/18/97; SN. 08/740,043, filed 10/23/96, now U.S. patent 5,758,072; SN. 08/158,026, filed 11/26/93, now U.S. patent 5,594,910; SN. 07/388,156, filed 07/28/89, now U.S. patent 5,347,632; SN. 07/328,790, filed 03/23/89, abandoned; SN. 07/219,931, filed 07/15/88, abandoned; and related applications: SN. 09/369,650, filed 08/06/99, pending; SN. 08/933,500, filed 09/18/97, pending; SN. 08/158,025, filed 11/23/93, pending; SN. 08/158,09, filed 11/23/93, pending; SN. 08/158,031, filed 11/26/93, now U.S. patent 5,796,967; SN. 08/158,033, filed 11/26/93, now U.S. patent 5,442,771; as well as Applicants' discussion of experimental use prior to the filing of application SN. 07/388,156 submitted in their prior applications; for example, on August 5, 1997 in connection with application SN. 08/740,043.

Accordingly, in view of the noted amendments and preceding remarks, Applicants would respectfully submit that their invention is patentably distinguished from the art or record, and that all objections raised by the Examiner have been resolved. Therefore, Applicants, requests reconsideration of their application and issuance of a patent thereon.

Dated: July 28, 2000

Respectfully submitted,


Paul C. Scifo, Esq.

Reg. No.: 27,089

Attorney for Applicants


10 Lee Court

Franklin Square, New York 11010

(516) 488-2315

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, on July 28, 2000

Name of Registered Representative: Paul C. Scifo, Esq.

Signature: 

Date: July 28, 2000